



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,156	03/01/2004	Katherine Woo	2043.011US1	3410
49845	7590	11/16/2010	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/EBAY			FADOK, MARK A	
P.O. BOX 2938			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			3625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/16/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@SLWIP.COM  
request@slwip.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/791,156	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WOO, KATHERINE	
	<b>Examiner</b> MARK FADOK	<b>Art Unit</b> 3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/28/2010 has been entered.

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 12/28/2009, which was received 4/28/2010. Acknowledgement is made to the amendment to claims 1,10,18, and 22. Applicant's amendment and remarks were carefully considered, but were not persuasive. Therefore the previous rejection modified as necessitated by amendment follows:

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sacks (US 2002/0016765 A1).

Regarding claims 1-9

Sacks discloses a method comprising receiving, from a shopping cart application, detailed information, in response to a user request to proceed with a payment for one or more items; and upon receiving the detailed information from the shopping cart application being hosted by the seller web-site, the seller web site being separate from an online payment service (para 0016-0023), the detailed information being collected in the shopping cart prior to being collected in the shopping cart prior to being sent from the seller web site to the online payment service by the shopping cart application in response to a user request to proceed with a payment for the one or more items; upon receiving the detailed information from the shopping cart application, communicating via a communications network one or more user interfaces that facilitate processing of the payment for the one or more items by the online payment service. See particularly paragraph [0028].

Detailed information may include item name, item number, item price, and item quantity. See paragraph [0017].

The user request to proceed with the payment is received when the user clicks a checkout button. See paragraph [0020].

Applicant's attention is directed to paragraphs [0036]-[0046] for a more detailed discussion of the method.

Regarding claims 10-24

These claims are written as apparatus, system, and computer readable medium for performing the functions recited in the method of claims 1-9. These claims are rejected under a similar line of reasoning.

### **Alternative Rejection**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacks in view of Ferguson et al. (5,966,697).**

#### Regarding claims 1-9

Sacks discloses a method comprising receiving, from a shopping cart application, detailed information, in response to a user request to proceed with a payment for one or more items; and upon receiving the detailed information from the shopping cart application being hosted by the seller web-site, the seller web site being separate from an online payment service (para 0016-0023), Applicant has argued the location of the virtual shopping cart being at the merchant site and a dissenting vote was cast in the 2/3/2009 BPAI decision siding with this characterization of Sacks. To address this issue, the examiner is providing this alternative rejection. Applicant argues that Sacks does not teach "the detailed information being collected in the shopping cart prior to being

Art Unit: 3625

collected in the shopping cart prior to being sent from the seller web site to the online payment service by the shopping cart application in response to a user request to proceed with a payment for the one or more items". However, Ferguson in the same field of endeavor teaches a virtual shopping cart program that resides at a seller's site, collects information and transfers the information to the payment processor when the user checks out (FIG 2,3 and col 3, lines 57-59). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a shopping cart application to a merchant for collection of shopping information to be sent to the payment processor, because this will assure compatibility with other stores and the payment processor (Ferguson, Col 3, lines 57-59) and also assure a safe secure connection for checkout regardless of the merchant site from which the user selects products (Ferguson, col 5, lines 15-25).

upon receiving the detailed information from the shopping cart application,  
communicating via a communications network one or more user interfaces that facilitate processing of the payment for the one or more items by the online payment service.

See particularly paragraph [0028].

Detailed information may include item name, item number, item price, and item quantity. See paragraph [0017].

The user request to proceed with the payment is received when the user clicks a checkout button. See paragraph [0020].

Applicant's attention is directed to paragraphs [0036]-[0046] for a more detailed discussion of the method.

Regarding claims 10-24

These claims are written as apparatus, system, and computer readable medium for performing the functions recited in the method of claims 1-9. These claims are rejected under a similar line of reasoning.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 4/28/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has amended the claims to further clarify that the collecting of information in the shopping cart occurs prior to sending of the information from the merchant to the payment service. This feature was previously addressed by the Board of Appeals in the decision mailed 2/3/2009. The examiner presents the decision below. Applicant appears to be trying to amend to more align the claims with the lone dissenting opinion found in the 2/3/2009 opinion pages 15-19. To address this opinion the examiner provides an alternate rejection supra.

The following is the arguments presented by the BPAI in the decision 2008-2955, pages 6-11 mailed 2/3/2009. As stated in the decision in regards to claim 1, Sacks teaches inter alia, a seller site hosting a shopping cart and states the reasoning as follows:

“A determination that a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) involves two analytical steps. First, the Board must interpret the claim language, where necessary. Because the PTO is entitled to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, our review of the Board's claim construction is limited to determining whether it was reasonable. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1055 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Secondly, the Board must compare the construed claim to a prior art reference and make factual findings that "each and every limitation is found either expressly or inherently in [that] single prior art reference." *Celeritas Techs. Ltd. v. Rockwell Int'l Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1354, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 1998)." *In re Crish*, 393 F.3d 1253, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Claim 1 defines a method comprising two steps. In the first step, a virtual shopping cart application sends detailed information concerning one or more items placed by a user in a virtual shopping cart in response to a user request to proceed with a payment for the one or more items. According to claim 1, the virtual shopping cart application is "external" to an online payment service and the virtual shopping cart is hosted by a "seller" web site. In the second step, once the detailed information concerning one or more items placed by a user in a virtual shopping cart is received from the shopping cart application, one or more user interfaces that facilitate processing of the payment for the one or more items is communicated to the user via a communications network. According to claim 1, the one or more user interfaces allows the user to view the contents of the virtual shopping cart.



No term used in the claim is provided with a corresponding definition in the Specification. Accordingly, we look to the words of the claim, giving each their ordinary and customary meaning. "Claim construction begins, as it must, with the words of the claims. See *Bell Communications Research, Inc. v. Vitalink Communications Corp.*, 55 F.3d 615,619-20 (Fed. Cir. 1995)." *Vehicular Techs. Corp. v. Titan Wheel Int'l*, 141 F.3d 1084, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1998). But we determine the scope of the claims in patent applications not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon giving claims "their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification" and "in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Am. Acad. ofSci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2004). Our interpretation of disputed language must be reasonable in light of all the evidence before the Board. See *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1055 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("The question then is whether the PTO's interpretation of the disputed claim language is "reasonable." ... We conclude that the PTO's interpretation is reasonable in light of all the evidence before the Board.").

As it is commonly understood, a virtual shopping cart application is an application which facilitates a user selecting an item from an online catalogue and transferring the selected item to a virtual shopping cart where the item sits until such time the user decides to check-out and proceed to pay for the selected items in the cart? In that respect, the first step of the claimed process reiterates the generally-understood operation of a virtual shopping cart application.

The second step of the claimed process calls for communicating an interface to the user to facilitate processing of the payment and allow the user to view the contents of the virtual shopping cart once selected items for purchase are placed in the shopping cart. Since a web page is a well known example of an interface, the second step of the claim broadly covers presenting to the user a web page to both view the contents of the virtual shopping cart and facilitate processing for the payment of selected items in the cart.

As for the limitation that the virtual shopping cart application is "external" to an online payment service, given "external's ordinary and customary meaning (FF 4), the claimed method requires the virtual shopping cart application to be outside an online payment service (e.g., PayPal®, see Specification [0003]).

As for the limitation that the virtual shopping cart is hosted by a "seller" web site, given "seller's ordinary and customary meaning (FF 7), the claimed method requires the virtual shopping cart to be hosted by a web site pertaining to trade.

Putting it all together, the broadest reasonable construction of claim 1 in light of the Specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art is that it describes a method for using a virtual shopping cart application, situated outside an online payment service, to operate a virtual shopping cart hosted by a seller web site to present to the user of the shopping cart a web page to both view the contents of the virtual shopping cart and facilitate processing for the payment of selected items in the cart.

We turn now to the second step of the anticipation analysis.

Art Unit: 3625

Sacks (FF 9-12) shows using a payment processor comprising various components, including a "payment processing module." The "payment processing module" of the payment processor interfaces with external financial entities and is thus outside an online payment service. This would appear to meet the claimed limitation that the virtual shopping cart application is "external" to an online payment service. The Sacks payment processor further forms a website operated by a third-party to process a buyer's payment for a transaction made with an online seller. It comprises a seller interface and a buyer interface and the buyer interface may be used to update a shopping cart. See [0032]. The shopping cart (e.g., a buyer's shopping cart) may be stored in a database on the payment processor and managed by the payment processor (see [0028]). Thus, the payment processor hosts the shopping cart. Since Sack's third-party payment- processing website hosts the shopping cart and is used in trade, Sack's website represents a "seller" website hosting a shopping cart and thus appears to meet the claim limitation the virtual shopping cart is hosted by a "seller" web site. Finally, as the Examiner has explained (Answer 3), Sacks describes its method as receiving information from the shopping cart (including e.g., item name, see [0017]) in response to a user request to proceed with payment for a selected item and communicating to the user an interface to facilitate processing of the payment (see [0016]). Accordingly, it would appear that Sacks describes the operation of a virtual shopping cart application to the extent claimed.

Having compared the claim, in its broadest reasonable construction in light of the Specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art, to Sacks and

Art Unit: 3625

finding that all the limitations of the claim are expressly described therein, we agree with the Examiner that Sacks anticipates the claimed subject matter.”

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **571.272.6755**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Jeffrey A. Smith** can be reached on **571.272.6763**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner for Patents***

***P.O. Box 1450***

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

**571-273-8300** [Official communications; including  
After Final communications labeled  
"Box AF"]

For general questions the receptionist can be reached at  
**571.272.3600**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 3625

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Mark Fadok/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625